

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 03579 01 OF 06 072015Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-05 INR-10 L-03 ACDA-12
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 SP-02 TRSE-00 H-01 MCE-00
OMB-01 NRC-05 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 /068 W
-----044740 072104Z /70

O 071945Z APR 78
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0585
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO FPA WASHDC
ALL NATO CAPITALS
USLOSACLANT NORFOLK VA
CINCLANT NORFOLK VA
USNMR SHAPE BE
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 06 USNATO 03579

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
SUBJECT: NATO DEFENSE INITIATIVES: ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM
ANNEXES IN DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON LTDP

REFS: (A) USNATO 3504 DTG 061615Z APR 78, (B) USNATO 3487
DTG 061130Z APR 78, NOTAL, (C) STATE 083712 DTG 312350Z
MAR 78, NOTAL

-

SUMMARY: REF A CONTAINS OUR OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE
EWG'S DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT (AC/281(LTP)WP(78)2)
AND OUR RECOMMENDATION FOR THE GENERAL APPROACH THE
US SHOULD TAKE AT THE APRIL 13 EWG MEETING CALLED TO
DISCUSS THE REPORT. WE PROVIDE BELOW OUR ASSESSMENTS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE INDIVIDUAL ANNEXES
OF THE REPORT. ACTION REQUESTED: BY OOB APRIL 12,
GUIDANCE FOR THE APRIL 13 EWG MEETING. END SUMMARY

-

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 03579 01 OF 06 072015Z

1. DRAFT REPORT TO HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT.
AS WE REPORT SEPTEL, THE EWG CHAIRMAN DOES NOT PROPOSE
TO WORK THIS REPORT AT THE APRIL 13 MEETING. HOWEVER,
HE WOULD LIKE A FIRST READING ON THE APPROACH TAKEN
IN THE DRAFT, IN PARTICULAR THE BREAKDOWN OF THE
DISCUSSION OF PROGRAMS INTO "OBJECTIVE", "PROGRAMS
ALREADY APPROVED", AND "PROGRAMS REFERRED TO HEADS OF

STATE AND GOVERNMENT". HE DOES NOT PROPOSE TO DISCUSS THE CONTENT OF THE PARAGRAPHS ON THE PROGRAMS OR OF ANY OTHER PARAGRAPHS, SO WE ONLY REQUIRE WASHINGTON'S REACTION TO THE APPROACH THE DRAFT TAKES.

2. COSTING. IF FOR ANY REASON PARAGRAPH 6 OF THE DRAFT REPORT TO THE SUMMIT COMES UP FOR DISCUSSION, WE PROPOSE TO TAKE THE LINE THAT THE TOTAL COST FIGURE OF 90 BILLION DOLLARS LOOKS TOO HIGH (PARTICULARLY FOLLOWING EWG ACTION ON MARCH 21-23 THAT WILL REDUCE COSTS), BUT THAT IN ANY EVENT THE FIGURE IS PREMATURE UNTIL THE BLANKS ARE FILLED IN ON THE INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS. APROPOS OF THE BLANK COST FIGURES IN THE INDIVIDUAL ANNEXES, THERE IS SOME FEELING AMONG THE IS AND ALLIED DEFADS (SEPTTEL) THAT TOTAL COST DATA WOULD NOT HELP GAIN ACCEPTANCE FOR THE PROGRAMS AND THAT THE COST PARAGRAPHS SHOULD THEREFORE BE DELETED. ON APRIL 7 WE SENT TO WASHINGTON, VIA DACOM, THE IS FIGURES FOR TOTAL COSTS IN EACH PROGRAM AREA. HOWEVER, THE IS PRESENTLY HAS NO PLANS FOR USING THEM IN THE COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.

-

3. READINESS (ANNEX A)

- A. ASSUMING THAT THE BLANKS IN THE ANTI-ARMOR PROGRAM ARE FILLED IN WITH NUMBERS ACCEPTABLE TO THE US, WE ARE GENERALLY SATISFIED WITH THIS SECTION. IT IS -- CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 03579 01 OF 06 072015Z

ON BALANCE -- CHALLENGING BUT WITHIN THE REALM OF THE POSSIBLE.

- B. WE HAVE DISCUSSED WITH THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF THE FACT THAT THE ANNEX DOES NOT EXPLICITLY INVITE MINISTERIAL ENDORSEMENT OF PERM REP ACTION ON COMMON FAMILIES OF ANTI-ARMOR AND AIR-TO-GROUND WEAPONS. THE IS CONSIDERS THAT IMPLICIT ENDORSEMENT IS SUFFICIENT AND APPROPRIATE. THE PRESENT WORDING HIGHLIGHTS THE TWO FAMILIES, WHICH IS MORE THAN WILL BE DONE FOR MOST OF THE OTHER ITEMS DEALT WITH AT PERMREP LEVEL. FURTHER, EXPLICIT REFERENCE TO COMMON DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWO FAMILIES OPENS THE DOOR FOR INCLUDING THEM IN ANY DOCUMENTS PREPARED FOR PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS.

- C. WE WOULD THEREFORE RECOMMEND ONLY ONE SUBSTANTIVE US PROPOSAL ON THE ANNEX AT THIS TIME, AND THAT IS ON THE AIR-TO-SURFACE MUNITIONS MINISTERIAL RECOMMENDATION (PARAGRAPH 16(E)) WHICH NOW READS IN PART: "THE OBJECT SHALL BE TO MEET THE DEFICIENCIES AS SET OUT AT APPENDIX II WHEREVER PRACTICABLE". WE BELIEVE

WE WOULD BE BETTER OFF WITH THE ALLIES MORE FIRMLY
COMMITTED TO DO PERHAPS SOMEWHAT LESS RATHER THAN AGREEING
TO APPENDIX II WHEREVER PRACTICABLE. AS WE ARE RUEFULLY
AWARE, HOWEVER, THEY GENERALLY NEED NO URGING TO DO LESS.
THUS WE RECOMMEND THAT US ACTION IN THIS AREA BE LIMITED
TO PROPOSING DELETION OF THE WORDS "WHEREVER PRACTICABLE."

- D. WE ALSO RECOMMEND THAT WASHINGTON TAKE A
CLOSE LOOK AT THE NUMBERS FOR THE US WHICH FINALLY
EMERGED UNDER RECATEGORIZATION OF FORCES, AFTER SOME

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 03579 02 OF 06 072023Z

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-05 INR-10 L-03 ACDA-12
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 SP-02 TRSE-00 H-01 MCE-00
OMB-01 NRC-05 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 /068 W
-----044879 072106Z /70

O 071945Z APR 78

FM USMISSION USNATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0586

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO FPA WASHDC

ALL NATO CAPITALS

USLOSACLANT NORFOLK VA

CINCLANT NORFOLK VA

USNMR SHAPE BE

USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 06 USNATO 03579

CONFUSION ON THE EWG WORKSHEET WHICH CARRIED OVER TO
THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF DRAFTING SESSION.

-

4. REINFORCEMENT (ANNEX B)

- A. THE TASK FORCE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS ON REINFORCE-
MENT ELICITED A GOOD DEAL OF SUPPORT AT THE MARCH 21-23
EWG MEETING. THE IS DRAFTERS HAVE PRODUCED A STRAIGHT
FORWARD REINFORCEMENT ANNEX, WHOSE DEGREE OF CHALLENGE
IS CONSISTENT WITH THAT SUPPORT AND WHOSE RECOMMENDATIONS,
FOR MINISTERIAL ACTION PRESERVE THE TASK FORCE RECOM-
MENDATIONS INTACT. THE ANNEX ALSO SEEMS IN CONSONANCE
WITH US VIEWS. WE NOTE, HOWEVER, THAT THE RECOMMENDATION
FOR MINISTERS IN PARAGRAPH 8 (D) II DOES NOT MAKE

SPECIFIC LINKAGE BETWEEN A US COMMITMENT TO MODIFY AN
ADDITIONAL 22 WIDE BODY LONG RANGE CIVIL AIRCRAFT BY
1990 WITH COMMITMENT TO AN INTERNATIONALLY FUNDED
PROGRAM TO MODIFY 23 CIVIL AIRCRAFT FROM OTHER MEMBER
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 03579 02 OF 06 072023Z

COUNTRIES BY 1990. THE TASK FORCE REPORT DID NOT MAKE
ANY LINKAGE, AND WE ARE NOT CLEAR WHETHER THE US WANTS
EXPLICIT LINKAGE MADE. DURING A RECENT CONVERSATION
WITH A MISSION OFFICER, THE US CAPC REP (BARRY) POINTED
OUT THAT THE US MAY BE PLANNING TO MODIFY ONLY THE FIRST
65 AIRCRAFT, OR SOMETHING ON THAT ORDER, AND NOT PROCEED
WITH AN ADDITIONAL 22 AS PROPOSED IN THE TF-2 REPORT,
AND THAT, FURTHER, THERE MAY NOT BE A NEED FOR THE
ADDITIONAL 23 ALLIED AIRCRAFT ANYWAY.

- B. WE WOULD HAVE PREFERRED A STRONGER RECOMMEN-
DATION ON IMPROVEMENT TO RECEPTION FACILITIES.
HOWEVER, THE TASK FORCE REPORT ITSELF CALLS ONLY FOR
FURTHER STUDY. CONSEQUENTLY, UNLESS WASHINGTON HAS
IMPROVED WORDING ON THE RECOMMENDATION FOR MODIFICATIONS
TO CIVIL AIRCRAFT, WE RECOMMEND ACCEPTING ANNEX B AS IS.

5. RESERVE MOBILIZATION (ANNEX C)

- A. GIVEN THE OUTCOME OF EWG DISCUSSIONS ON RESERVE
MOBILIZATION, WE ARE GENERALLY NOT UNHAPPY WITH THE DRAFT
WHEN WE CONTEMPLATE WHAT A "LOWEST COMMON DENOMINATOR"
REPORT IN THIS AREA MIGHT RESEMBLE. HOWEVER, WE CONTINUE
TO FLAG TO WASHINGTON'S ATTENTION WHAT IS, IN OUR OPINION,
AN UNREALISTICALLY LOW LONG-TERM GOAL WITH RESPECT TO
PROVIDING ADDITIONAL EUROPEAN RESERVE BRIGADES, NAMELY
10 2/3RDS BRIGADES (12 2/3RDS COUNTING THE TURKS) IN THE
1985-1990 TIME FRAME OUT OF A LARGE POOL OF UNCOMMITTED
RESERVISTS.

- B. WE DO NOT YET BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE FULLY IM-
PRESSED ON OUR ALLIES THAT THERE IS A CERTAIN ECONOMIC
ILLOGIC IN EQUIPPING AN EVER-INCREASING NUMBER OF US
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 03579 02 OF 06 072023Z

DIVISIONS WITH TWO SETS OF COMBAT EQUIPMENT EACH AND
THE TRANSPORT NECESSARY TO GET TO EUROPE RAPIDLY WHEN THE
EUROPEANS ARE FAILING TO DO THEIR PART WITH ENORMOUS
UNUTILIZED AND UNDERUTILIZED RESERVE ASSETS WHICH COULD
BE EQUIPPED AND MOVED INTO POSITION FOR FRACTIONS OF

THE COST AND TIME REQUIRED FOR CONUS BASED US TROOPS.

- C. WE WOULD THEREFORE RECOMMEND THAT THE US CONSIDER PROPOSING MUCH STRONGER LANGUAGE TO THE ABOVE EFFECT, OR, ALTERNATIVELY AND AS A MINIMUM, PROPOSE RECOMMENDATION 6 (IX) BE REWORDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:
"MAKE PLANS FOR THE PROVISION OF EXTRA UNITS FROM RESERVE MANPOWER SO AS TO STRENGTHEN NATO'S DEFENSES. AS A MINIMUM, NATIONS ARE REQUESTED TO FORM ADDITIONAL RESERVE BRIGADES IN THE PERIOD 1987-1990 AS FOLLOWS:"

6. MARITIME POSTURE (ANNEX D)

- A. LIKE THE TASK FORCE 4 REPORT ITSELF, THIS ANNEX OFFERS A MODEST CHALLENGE TO NATIONS. WE FIND IT GENERALLY CONSISTENT WITH US VIEWS.

- B. IN GENERAL, THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE PROPERLY FRAMED. IN RECOMMENDATION C (III) WE NOTE, HOWEVER, THE ABSENCE OF ANY REFERENCE TO COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT, AND A REQUEST ONLY FOR AGREEMENT IN PRINCIPLE. WE SUGGEST, THEREFORE, THAT, IF THE TACTICAL SITUATION SEEMS PROPITIOUS, WE PROPOSE AMENDING THAT RECOMMENDATION TO READ QUOTE THE COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT AND THE ACQUISITION IN THE LONG-TERM OF AN ADVANCED ACOUSTIC SENSOR SYSTEM UNQUOTE.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 03579 03 OF 06 072031Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-05 INR-10 L-03 ACDA-12
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 SP-02 TRSE-00 H-01 MCE-00
OMB-01 NRC-05 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 /068 W
-----045002 072109Z /70

O 071945Z APR 78
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0587
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO FPA WASHDC
ALL NATO CAPITALS
USLOSACLANT NORFOLK VA
CINCLANT NORFOLK VA
USNMR SHAPE BE
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

CONFIDENTIAL SECTION 03 OF 06 USNATO 03579

- C. THE ANNEX DOES NOT PROPOSE THE DESIGNATION OF SACLANT AS SINGLE MANAGER FOR MARITIME POSTURE. THE TASK FORCE REPORT HAD NO SUCH RECOMMENDATION, AND IT MAY BE BETTER TO PURSUE THE MATTER IN CONNECTION WITH FOLLOW-UP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE.

-

7. AIR DEFENSE (ANNEX E)

- A. WE CONSIDER THAT THE AIR DEFENSE ANNEX IS GENERALLY WELL WRITTEN, IS CERTAINLY CHALLENGING (PROGRAMS RECOMMENDED BY TASK FORCE 5 HAVE SURVIVED UNSCATHED) AND HIGHLIGHTS THE REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS IN EACH OF THE SIX MAJOR AREAS (IDENTIFICATION, COMMUNICATIONS, AIR COMMAND AND CONTROL, LAND/MARITIME INTERFACE, FIGHTER AIRCRAFT, AND SURFACE TO AIR WEAPONS).

- B. JUDGING FROM THE 22 MARCH EWG, WE ANTICIPATE THAT ALLIES WILL BALK AT ACCEPTING THE BASIC PROGRAM IN CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 03579 03 OF 06 072031Z

TOTAL PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS IN THE NEAR TERM AND UNCERTAINTIES IN THE OUTYEARS. FURTHER, THE US ITSELF HAS SOME DIFFICULTY WITH THE SURFACE-TO-AIR PROGRAM. TO OVERCOME THIS PROBLEM, WE BELIEVE THE "RECOMMENDATION" SHOULD EMPHASIZE THE NEED TO GET MOVING IN EACH ACTION AREA AND DE-EMPHASIZE THE REQUIREMENT FOR TOTAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE BASIC PROGRAM, ESPECIALLY SINCE IT MUST AND WILL CHANGE AS THE ALLIANCE MOVES AHEAD IN THE NEXT DECADE. IN THIS REGARD, WE BELIEVE THE KEY TO MOVING FORWARD IS DESIGNATING AN AIR DEFENSE SINGLE MANAGER WHO CAN MONITOR, EXPEDITE AND INSURE THAT A BALANCED, INTEGRATED PROGRAM IS MAINTAINED AS THE NECESSARILY DIVERSE AND SEPARATE ACTIVITIES OCCUR OVER THE NEXT 10-15 YEARS.

- C. WE RECOMMEND THAT AT THE MARCH 13 EWG MEETING THE US PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING SUBSTITUTE WORDING FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS, PARAGRAPH 11, QUOTE:

- 11 DEFENSE MINISTERS ARE INVITED TO:

- (A) AGREE THAT DETAILED PLANNING AND ACTIONS WILL BEGIN IMMEDIATELY TO ACHIEVE AND MAINTAIN AN ADEQUATE, BALANCED AND INTEGRATED ALLIANCE AIR DEFENSE CAPABILITY DRAWING UPON THE BASIC PROGRAM.

- (B) DESIGNATE SACEUR AS SINGLE PROJECT MANAGER FOR AIR DEFENSE AND GRANT HIM THE NECESSARY

AUTHORITY TO IMPLEMENT THE AIR DEFENSE PROGRAM, KEEPING IT INTEGRATED AND BALANCED BY CLOSE CONCERT WITH NATIONS AND WITH NATO CIVIL AND MILITARY AUTHORITIES INCLUDING SACLANT AND CINCHAN. END QUOTE.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 03579 03 OF 06 072031Z

- D. WE ANTICIPATE FLAK ON THE SINGLE MANAGER PORTION OF THE RECOMMENDATION SINCE THAT CONCEPT HAS AS YET GAINED NO ACCEPTANCE. WE HOPE THE CONCEPT WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE SEPARATE REPORT ON FOLLOW-THROUGH MACHINERY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES, WHENEVER IT ISSUES, BUT WILL BE ON FIRM PROCEDURAL GROUND FOR RAISING IT IN CONNECTION WITH THE AIR DEFENSE ANNEX SINCE THE TF-5 REPORT PROPOSED A SINGLE MANAGER -- SACEUR.

8. COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL (ANNEX F).

. A. THE ANNEX ON C3 IS RATHER BLAND IN FLAVOR. WHILE THE C3 PROGRAMS CONTAIN SOME CHALLENGES FOR THE ALLIES, THE PRIMARY THRUST IS TO EXPEDITE (OR AT LEAST ASSURE) PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS MOST OF WHICH ARE ALREADY IN SOME STATE OF PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, OR IMPLEMENTATION. THE DRAFT ANNEX SIDE-STEPS THE MOST CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES-- COMMON FUNDING AND ASSIGNING TO SHAPE THE ROLE OF SINGLE MANAGER FOR ALL PROGRAMS EXCEPT NICS STAGE II. DESPITE THIS, WE BELIEVE THAT IT IS GENERALLY SATISFACTORY. SACEUR PREVIOUSLY DESIGNATED C3 IMPROVEMENTS AS HIS TOP PRIORITY, SO THE ALLIES AND NATO ALREADY HAVE BEGUN WORK IN THIS AREA. SIMILARLY, THE POOR STATE OF COMMUNICATIONS INTEROPERABILITY HAS GENERATED SEVERAL INITIATIVES FOR IMPROVEMENT. FOR THESE REASONS THE JOB OF TF 6 WAS MORE ONE OF INTEGRATING ON-GOING PROGRAMS THAN OF CONCEIVING NEW ONES. IN OUR VIEW, THE RECOMMENDATIONS PROVIDE FOR A BALANCED, INTEGRATED PROGRAM, AND WE EXPECT THAT THE ALLIES WILL ACCEPT THEM AS NOW WRITTEN.

. B. THE RECOMMENDATIONS FALL SHORT OF US DESIRES IN SOME RESPECTS. AGREEMENT TO SEVEN OF THE RECOMMENDED

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 03579 04 OF 06 072039Z

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-05 INR-10 L-03 ACDA-12
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 SP-02 TRSE-00 H-01 MCE-00
OMB-01 NRC-05 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 /068 W
-----045171 072117Z /70

O 071945Z APR 78
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0588
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO FPA WASHDC
ALL NATO CAPITALS
USLOSACLANT NORFOLK VA
CINCLANT NORFOLK VA
USNMR SHAPE BE
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 04 OF 06 USNATO 03579

PROGRAMS "IN PRINCIPLE" LEAVES OUR ALLIES CONSIDERABLE ROOM FOR PROCRASTINATION AND EQUIVOCATION IN THE FUTURE. FURTHER, THE RECOMMENDATIONS DO NOT ADDRESS MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMS, I.E., DESIGNATING SACEUR AS SINGLE MANAGER. WE BELIEVE THAT US EFFORTS TO STRENGTHEN THE REPORT IN THESE RESPECTS WOULD ENCOUNTER STRONG OPPOSITION. SOME ALLIES DO NOT AGREE WITH ALL DETAILS OF ALL PROGRAMS PROPOSED BY TF 6, AND "AGREEMENT IN PRINCIPLE" GIVES THEM THE OPPORTUNITY FOR LATER NEGOTIATION ON THE DISAGREEABLE ASPECTS. SIMILARLY, SOME ALLIES OPPOSE GIVING SHAPE SINGLE-MANAGER RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROGRAMS THEY CONSIDER "NATIONAL" AND WHICH THE CNAD HAS ON ITS PLATE (E.G., NEAR- AND MID-TERM TACTICAL TRUNK NETWORK INTEROPERABILITY AND SCRA). UNDENIABLE BENEFITS WOULD ACCRUE IF MINISTERS GAVE A FIRM COMMITMENT TO THE C3 PROGRAMS, DESIGNATED SACEUR AS THEIR SINGLE MANAGER, AND AGREED TO COMMON FUNDING FOR THEM. HOWEVER, THE BATTLE TO ACHIEVE THIS STAGE COULD BE COSTLY. IT COULD OPEN THE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 03579 04 OF 06 072039Z

PROGRAMS TO DETAILED COMMENT, AND WE COULD LOSE EVEN AGREEMENT IN PRINCIPLE TO THE PROGRAMS AS NOW ARTICULATED. WITH THE RECOGNIZED HIGH LEVEL INTEREST IN IMPROVING C3, WE BELIEVE THAT SUFFICIENT PRESSURE CAN BE APPLIED TO ASSURE PROGRESS IN THIS AREA.

. C. WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE NATO CONTROLLER OF INFRASTRUCTURE HAS BEEN TASKED TO PREPARE AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT ON THE NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM OF THOSE PROPOSALS IN TASK FORCE REPORTS CALLING FOR COMMON FUNDING. (THESE PROPOSALS NOT ONLY AFFECT THE LEVEL OF FUNDING,

BUT IN THE CASE OF C3 ALSO WOULD NECESSITATE FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES IN CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES.) WE DO NOT KNOW WHEN, HOW, OR TO WHAT END THIS ANALYSIS WILL BE INTRODUCED INTO THE EWG. UNDOUBTEDLY, SOME ALLIES WILL OPPOSE COMMON FUNDING OF PROJECTS NOW CONSIDERED "NATIONAL".

. D. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE US SUPPORT ANY EFFORT BY AN ALLY TO STRENGTHEN THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN ANNEX F. IF NONE MATERIALIZES, THE US SHOULD ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS AS WRITTEN. IT MAY BE BETTER TO PURSUE THE MATTER OF C3 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH FOLLOW-UP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE.

.
9. ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) (ANNEX G)

A. THE ANNEX'S TREATMENT OF EW IS CERTAINLY CHALLENGING AS IT AGAIN CONFRONTS NATIONS WITH ALL OF TF-7'S RECOMMENDED EQUIPMENT PROGRAMS. WHILE THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF (IS) DRAFTERS SHOWED SOME INITIATIVE IN SUGGESTING SLIGHTLY MORE PALATABLE VERSIONS OF A FEW OF THE ORIGINAL PROGRAMS, AT THIS MOMENT WE CANNOT PREDICT SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER NATIONAL ACCEPTANCE. WE STILL HOPE THAT SOME IMPROVEMENT

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 03579 04 OF 06 072039Z

WILL BE REALIZED THROUGH TF MISSIONARY WORK (REF B).

B. THE EQUIPMENT PROGRAMS THEMSELVES DO NOT APPEAR INCOMPATIBLE WITH US EW PLANS AND PROGRAMS; THE OTHER IS RECOMMENDATIONS MAY PRESENT SOME DIFFICULTY. THE CHALLENGE TO THE US LIES IN THE REPORT'S TREATMENT OF IMPROVED INFORMATION SHARING, AN AREA IN WHICH, JUSTIFIABLY OR UNJUSTIFIABLY, THE US REPUTATION IS POOR. WE BELIEVE THAT TO RESPOND FULLY TO THE INTENT OF THE IS RECOMMENDATIONS WOULD ENTAIL SUBSTANTIAL REVISION OF EXISTING US DISCLOSURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, AN ACCOMPLISHMENT WE VIEW AS UNATTAINABLE IN THE SHORT TERM. NONETHELESS, AFTER REPEATED STATEMENTS THAT THE US IS REVISING DISCLOSURE POLICIES, IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF THE US DID NOT TAKE ISSUE WITH THIS CHALLENGE.

C. IN SUM, WE RECOMMEND SUPPORTING THE ANNEX AS IT STANDS.

.
-
10. RATIONALIZATION (ANNEX H)

- A. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS FORMULATION IS MUCH CRISPER THAN THE ORIGINAL DISCUSSION OF RATIONALIZATION CONTAINED IN THE TF-8 REPORT. IT CARRIES UP FRONT THE DISCUSSION OF "MISSION NEEDS" AND THE NATO ARMAMENTS PLANNING REVIEW (NAPR) PROCEDURES, WHICH IS IN KEEPING

WITH US EMPHASIS (REF C). HOWEVER, THE RECOMMENDATIONS
CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH 12 REVERT TO THE UNSPECIFIC
LANGUAGE OF THE TF-8 REPORT.

- B. WE BELIEVE THEREFORE, THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS
SHOULD BE RE-DRAFTED ALONG THE LINES OF REF C. ON

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 03579 05 OF 06 072046Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-05 INR-10 L-03 ACDA-12
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 SP-02 TRSE-00 H-01 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 MCE-00 OMB-01 NRC-05 /068 W
-----045290 072115Z /70

O 071945Z APR 78
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0589
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO FPA WASHDC
ALL NATO CAPITALS
USLOSACLANT NORFOLK VA
CINCLANT NORFOLK VA
USNMR SHAPE BE
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 05 OF 06 USNATO 03579

THAT BASIS, WE PROVIDE BELOW OUR SUGGESTED LANGUAGE FOR
PARAGRAPH 12: QUOTE

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12. DEFENSE MINISTERS ARE INVITED TO TAKE THE
FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

- (A) LONG-RANGE ARMAMENTS PLANNING
- AGREE:
- - THAT THE CNAD AD HOC STUDY GROUP ON PAPS
- IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE NATO MILITARY
- AUTHORITIES (NMA'S), SHOULD PROVIDE IN
- DECEMBER 1978 A MANAGERIAL AND PROCEDURAL
- FRAMEWORK TO IDENTIFY AND ANALYZE
- ALLIANCE MISSION NEEDS AS THE BASIS FOR
- COOPERATIVE ACTION. THIS FRAMEWORK SHOULD
- PROVIDE ACQUISITION STRATEGIES, ENCOMPASSING

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 03579 05 OF 06 072046Z

- LEGAL, FINANCIAL, CONTRACTURAL AND
- POLITICAL ASPECTS, AS WELL AS THE MILITARY
- AND TECHNICAL, AIMED AT MEETING THE MISSION
- NEEDS.

- - THAT THE IDENTIFIED NATO MISSION NEEDS BE
- INCORPORATED INTO NATIONAL WEAPONS
- ACQUISITION PLANNING CYCLES

- - THAT THE NATO ARMAMENTS PLANNING REVIEW
- (NAPR) SHOULD BE EXPANDED TO INCLUDE A
- FORMALIZED REVIEW OF ALL MAJOR ACQUISITION
- PROGRAMS THAT HAVE STANDARDIZATION/INTER-
- OPERABILITY IMPLICATIONS.

- (B) PROCEDURES FOR STANDARDIZATION/INTEROPERA-
- BILITY AGREEMENTS
- AGREE:

- - TO WRITE INTO THEIR OWN OPERATIONAL
- REQUIREMENTS THE SPECIFIC INTEROPERABILITY
- REQUIREMENTS OF THE MNCS, RELEVANT STANAGS
- AND DETAILS OF RELEVANT EQUIPMENTS OF
- OTHER NATIONS WITH WHICH THE NEW SYSTEM
- MUST INTEROPERATE;

- - TO WRITE INTO THEIR NATIONAL PROCEDURES
- FOR WEAPONS ACQUISITION THE REQUIREMENT
- THAT ALL SUBMISSIONS SEEKING APPROVAL FOR
- PROCUREMENT OF NEW EQUIPMENT SHOULD STATE
- WHETHER THE EQUIPMENT PROPOSED IS OF A
- TYPE FOR WHICH THE NMAS HAVE STATED A
- STANDARDIZATION REQUIREMENT AND WHETHER

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 03579 05 OF 06 072046Z

- AND HOW THIS IS TO BE MET;

- - TO INVITE THE COUNCIL TO ARRANGE FOR A
- JOINT CNAD/MC ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURE,
- CHARTER, AND FUNCTIONS OF THE MILITARY
- AGENCY FOR STANDARDIZATION TO INCLUDE
- SUCH CONSIDERATIONS AS:

- - REVISION OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF

- THE MAS SERVICE BOARDS, IF NECESSARY;
- - PROVIDING THE CHAIRMAN, MAS, WITH A
- SMALL MANAGEMENT AND CO-ORDINATION
- SECTION;
- - DETERMINING THE CO-ORDINATION AND
- RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE MAS AND THE
- CNAD IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF STANAGS.
- (C) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS (IPR)
- ENDORSE FOR AGREEMENT BY HEADS OF STATE
- AND GOVERNMENT:
- - THE NATO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRINCIPLES
- IN THE FIELD OF LICENSING AND CO-PRODUCTION
- FOR THE PURPOSE OF ARMAMENTS STANDARDIZATION
- OR INTEROPERABILITY AND THE GUIDELINES
- THEREON;
-
- - ALL ACTION TO ENSURE THAT APPROPRIATE IN-
- COUNTRY INSTRUCTIONS ARE ISSUED FOR THEIR
- RAPID IMPLEMENTATION;

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 03579 06 OF 06 072053Z
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-05 INR-10 L-03 ACDA-12
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 SP-02 TRSE-00 H-01 NSCE-00
SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00 MCE-00 OMB-01 NRC-05 /068 W
-----045528 072116Z /70

O 071945Z APR 78
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0590
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO FPA WASHDC
ALL NATO CAPITALS
USLOSACLANT NORFOLK VA
CINCLANT NORFOLK VA
USNMR SHAPE BE
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GER

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 06 OF 06 USNATO 03579

- C. WE UNDERSTAND THE US-PROPOSED LIST OF COOPERA-

TIVE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS (PARA 6, REF C) WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE TF-8 ANNEX BECAUSE ASYG MUMFORD BELIEVES THAT, PROCEDURALLY, THE US PROPOSAL SHOULD BE PRESENTED TO THE EWG FOR CONSIDERATION BEFORE IT SHOWS UP IN THE EWG REPORT. REF C WAS CIRCULATED TO THE EWG CHAIRMAN AND ALL NATIONAL EWG REPRESENTATIVES. THE CHAIRMAN INTENDS TO RAISE THE US PROPOSAL AT THE 13 APRIL EWG MEETING.

11. CONSUMER LOGISTICS (ANNEX J)

A. WE CONSIDER THIS ANNEX SUFFICIENTLY CHALLENGING. THE DRAFTERS HAVE MODIFIED THE TASK FORCE 9 RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING RESERVE STOCKS OF EQUIPMENT TO INDICATE AN IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD OF 10 YEARS, AND THEREFORE IT SHOULD NOT BE OVER-CHALLENGING TO OUR ALLIES, ALTHOUGH WE MAY BE FORCED AT A LATER PERIOD TO AGREE TO FURTHER DILUTION BY MODIFYING THE RECOMMENDATION TO STATE, "NATIONS SHOULD CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 03579 06 OF 06 072053Z

START PLANNING NOW TO PROVIDE WITHIN 10 YEARS RESERVE STOCKS ...".

B. ANNEX J IS GENERALLY CONSISTENT WITH EVOLVING US VIEWS. WE NOTE, HOWEVER, THAT IT INCLUDES RECOMMENDATIONS 13(H) AND (J) CONCERNING EARMARKING OF NATIONAL STOCKS FOR REALLOCATION IN AN EMERGENCY. WE ARE AWARE OF SOME CONCERN IN WASHINGTON THAT SUCH A PROVISION WOULD BE AN INVITATION TO RAID US STOCKS; HOWEVER, WE BELIEVE THAT THIS IS A NECESSARY PROVISION IN THE GENERAL MOVE TOWARD ASSURING ALLIED COMMANDERS THAT THEY CAN STOP AGGRESSION IN A LIMITED AREA PENDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASED STOCKS. ONE OTHER DEVIATION FROM US VIEWS OCCURS IN THE OMISSION OF ANY REFERENCE TO STRENGTHENING NATO'S LOGISTICS STAFF SUPPORT. EVEN IF WE ACCEPTED THE SYG'S POSITION THAT PROPOSALS FOR REORGANIZATION OF STAFFS ARE HIS RESPONSIBILITY, WE BELIEVE WE MUST TELL HIM WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE AND LET HIM WORK ON HOW TO DO IT. WE WOULD THEREFORE SUGGEST AN ADDITION TO RECOMMENDATION 13(A) AS FOLLOWS: "AND TO THIS EFFECT ENDORSED THE NEED TO STRENGTHEN LOGISTICS STAFF SUPPORT AT NATO'S CIVIL HEADQUARTERS (TO INCLUDE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL FOR LOGISTICS) AND WITHIN NATO MILITARY COMMANDS."

C. WE BELIEVE THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE PRESENT VERSION OF ANNEX J CONFORM GENERALLY WITH WASHINGTON VIEWS CONCERNING THE SUBJECT MATTER FOR REFERENCE TO MINISTERS. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS 13(H) AND (J), DISCUSSED ABOVE, THE ANNEX NOW GROUPS THE ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH AT PERM REP LEVEL IN RECOMMENDATION

(L). WE WOULD FORESEE SOMEWHAT MORE DETAIL WITHIN THIS
RECOMMENDATION AND CLARIFICATION AS TO WHICH OF THE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 03579 06 OF 06 072053Z

MATTERS HAVE BEEN "AGREED" BY PERM REPS, AND WHICH HAVE
ONLY BEEN "REMITTED FOR FURTHER STUDY".

D. ACCORDINGLY, WE RECOMMEND THAT THE US POSITION ON
ANNEX J DURING EWG MEETING OF 13 APRIL BE GENERALLY SUP-
PORTIVE. WE SHOULD PRESS OUR ADDITION TO RECOMMENDATION
13(A) AND BE PREPARED TO SUGGEST THE ABOVE MODIFICATION
TO 13(H) SHOULD IT APPEAR NECESSARY IN ORDER TO SAVE CON-
SIDERATION OF THE "RESERVE STOCKS OF EQUIPMENT" ISSUE.
WE SHOULD ASK THE IS TO DEVELOP A MORE SPECIFIC CATALOGUE
OF PERM REP ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION 13(L). FINALLY,
WE BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD ASK FOR DELETION OF THE WORD
"LIMITED", THE FOURTH WORD IN RECOMMENDATION 13(C).
BENNETT

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, REPORTS, MILITARY PLANS, INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENTS, PROGRAMS (PROJECTS)
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 07 apr 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978USNATO03579
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780151-0355
Format: TEL
From: USNATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780478/aaaacovn.tel
Line Count: 732
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 2adc34b4-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 14
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 78 USNATO 3504, 78 USNATO 3487
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 26 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3032394
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO DEFENSE INITIATIVES: ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM ANNEXES IN DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON LTDP
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/2adc34b4-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014